

Bereskin & Parr

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

Appl. No. : 10/787,315 Confirmation No.: 4333
Applicant : Jason T. Griffin
Filed : February 27, 2004
Title : TEXT INPUT SYSTEM FOR A MOBILE ELECTRONIC DEVICE
AND METHODS THEREOF
TC./A.U. : 2174
Examiner : Sherrod L. Keaton

Docket No. : 13210-18
Customer No. : 001059

February 21, 2008

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW MADE BY THE EXAMINER

The following is a response to the summary of a telephone interview with the Examiner on January 30, 2008, which was issued by the Examiner. Applicant notes that the due date to provide a response to the summary made by the Examiner is March 9, 2008. Accordingly, this response to the Telephone Interview Summary is timely filed.

Response To Summary of Examiner Telephone Interview Made By The Examiner

During the Examiner telephone interview of January 30th, 2008, the agent for the Applicant had a discussion with Examiners Keaton and Lu to discuss the nature of the claims of the subject application, the nature of the cited references and the differences between the claims of the subject application and the cited references.

In particular, the agent for the Applicant discussed how the claimed subject matter relates to a touch interface in which areas of the touch interface are associated with letters and that at least some of the areas overlap with one another. The agent for the Applicant then discussed how the claimed subject matter recites detecting a location of a user's touch on the touch interface and identifying the letter associated therewith which can be more than one letter if the location of the user's touch is on a region of the touch interface where the areas of the letters overlap with one another.

The agent for the Applicant then went on to explain how the cited references do not disclose a touch interface in which areas are associated with letters such that at least some of the areas overlap with one another. In particular, the agent for the Applicant discussed how the Chua reference (U.S. 2004/0183833) teaches providing a layout for the keys on a touch screen in which areas of the touch screen associated with the keys do not overlap with one another. The agent for the Applicant further described how Chua teaches using one of several distance-based and layout-based techniques (with non-overlapping key areas) to determine which key the user intended to select after touching a location on the touch screen. The agent for the Applicant referred to FIG. 3 in Chua as well as the corresponding text on pages 2 and 3 and used this information to show that Chua does not teach associating areas of the touch screen with letters to define areas that represent more than one key.

The Examiners agreed that there are differences between the subject application and the cited reference. The Examiners also expressed some concern with the portion of the independent claims of the subject invention that recite the association of areas of a

touch interface to letters and the overlapping of at least some of these areas and asked for an amendment of this claim language. The Examiners also requested amendment to the independent claims to better define the nature of the overlapping and if such amendments were made to the claims then the current claim rejections should be overcome although the Examiners also reserved the right to perform further searching.

Respectfully submitted,

BERESKIN & PARR

By Tony Orsi
Tony R. Orsi
Reg. No. 55,831
Tel: 416-957-1603